R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 012 724 UD 003 020

THE ECONOMIC STATUS OF NEGROES--IN THE NATION AND IN THE SOUTH. TOWARD REGIONAL REALISM, NUMBER 3.

BY- HENDERSON, VIVIAN W.
SOUTHERN REGIONAL COUNCIL, ATLANTA, GA.

PUB DATE 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.00 25P.

DESCRIPTORS- *ECONOMIC STATUS, *NEGROES, *SOUTHERN STATES, CAUCASIANS, ECONOMIC DISADVANTAGEMENT, URBAN IMMIGRATION, EMPLOYMENT, UNEMPLOYMENT, EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES, NEGRO EMPLOYMENT, EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES (JOBS), INCOME, WAGES, OCCUPATIONS, MANPOWER UTILIZATION, EDUCATIONAL DISCRIMINATION, RACIAL SEGREGATION, POPULATION TRENDS, VOCATIONAL EDUCATIONAL EDUCATION, TABLES (DATA), COMPARATIVE STATISTICS

THE SOUTH AND THE NEGRO ARE THE MOST DEPRESSED SEGMENTS OF THE ECONOMY AND THE POPULATION, AND IMPORTANTLY, THE EXTENT TO WHICH NEGROES ARE ABSORBED INTO THE ECONOMY WILL DETERMINE THE PACE WITH WHICH THE SOUTH REACHES PARITY OF INCOME LEVEL WITH THE REST OF THE NATION. IN COMPARISON WITH WHITES, NEGROES HAVE GAINED ONLY SLIGHTLY IN INCOME AND DOLLAR GAP, EMPLOYMENT, OCCUPATIONS, AND MANPOWER UTILIZATION. THE FINDINGS OF STUDIES OF THE EMPLOYMENT SITUATION OF NEGROES ALSO POINT UP THE CUMULATIVE EFFECTS OF SEGREGATED EDUCATION AND DISCRIMINATION ON EMPLOYMENT. THE INADEQUACIES OF A SEGREGATED EDUCATION ALSO CREATE AN INADEQUATE FLOW OF MANPOWER FOR THE FEW JOBS THAT ARE AVAILABLE. IN GENERAL, VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL TRAINING FOR NEGROES APPEARS TO BE LIMITED TO TRADES WHICH SERVE THEIR OWN RACE OR TO OBSOLESCENT INDUSTRIES. NEGROES ARE NOT BEING TRAINED FOR INDUSTRIES WITH GROWING MANPOWER NEEDS, LIKE ELECTRONICS, TOOL DESIGN, OR BUILDING TRADES. MAJOR "REVOLUTIONARY" CHANGES IN THE MANPOWER UTILIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF NEGROES ARE NEEDED TO IMPROVE THEIR SITUATION. THE INFLUENCE OF PUBLIC POLICY ON THE DESEGREGATION OF SCHOOLS, HOUSING, AND PUBLIC FACILITIES, AND ON EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY, IS INTEGRALLY RELATED TO IMPROVING THE NEGRO'S ECONOMIC POSITION. TWENTY-FOUR TABLES SUMMARIZE DATA ON POPULATION DISTRIBUTION, INCOME AND SALARY, AND OCCUPATIONS AMONG NEGROES AND WHITES IN THE SOUTH AND IN THE NATION. (NH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED012724

E ✓

ED 003 020

THE ECONOMIC STATUS OF NEGROES:

IN THE NATION AND IN THE SOUTH

by

Vivian W. Henderson

TOWARD REGIONAL REALISM

SOUTHERN REGIONAL COUNCIL

Vivian W. Henderson is professor and chairman of the Department of Economics and Business Administration at Fisk University. He is currently serving as a visiting professor at North Carolina State College of the University of North Carolina at Raleigh.

The author is indebted to T. S. Currier, Senior Professor at Fisk University and Chairman of the Department of History and Government, for his help in preparing this paper. Also, appreciation is extended to Martin Mutiaya and Boniface Tibagamburwa for help in compiling parts of the data.

The Economic Status of Negroes: in the Nation and in the South

Contents **Page**

I. Introduction: The State of Optimism 5

II. Structural Reorganization of the South 6

The South Loses Its People 6

Negroes Move to the Central Cities 7

Employment and Sources of Income 8

III. Negro Gain Has Been Slight 10

Income: Negroes Running Fast to Stand Still 11

Southern Negroes at the Bottom of Economic Ladder 13

Employment, Occupations, and Manpower Utilization 15

IV. What Price Discrimination? 19

Education 19

Cost of Discrimination 20

Race Relations and Economic Growth 21

Public Policy 21

Appendix 22

TABLES

Table 1. Nonwhite Population for Eleven Southern States, 1950-1960 6

Table 2. Population Change and Total Net Migration 1950-1960 and Net Migration of Nonwhites, 1940-1960 for Eleven Southern States 7

Table 3. Distribution of Population between Urban and Rural for Eleven States by Color, 1950-1960 . . . 8

Table 4. Population of Selected Urbanized Areas by Color, 1950-1960 9

Table 5. Income and Population of the South as a Percent of the United States, 1930-1961 9

Table 6. Per Capita Personal Income for Eleven Southern States, 1940-1962 10

Table 7. Estimated Purchasing Power of Negroes in Ten Selected Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas, 1961 11

Table 8. Percent Distribution of Income of Families by Color for United States, 1945-1961 12

Table 9. Median Wage and Salary Income of Persons 14 Years and Over with Wage and Salary Income by Color and Sex for Selected Years, 1939-1960 12

Table 10. Median Wage or Salary Income of Families and Unrelated Individuals with Wage and Salary Income by Color, 1940-1961 13

Table 11. Median Income of Persons 14 Years and Over with Income by Region and Color, 1950-1960 . . . 13

Table 12. Median Income of Families with Income by Region and Color, 1960 14

Table 13. Median Income of White and Nonwhite Families for Eleven Southern States, 1950-1960 14

Table 14. Median Income of White and Nonwhite Persons 14 Years and Over for Eleven States, South, and United States, 1950-1960 15

Table 15. Median Income of White and Nonwhite Male Workers for Eleven Southern States, 1950-1960 . . 15

Table 16. Nonwhite Employment as Percent of Total Employment in Each Major Occupation Group, by Sex, April 1940 and April 1960 16

Table 17. Distribution of Employed Persons in the South by Color and Sex and Major Occupation Groups, 1950-1960 17

Table 18. Nonwhites as a Percent of Total Persons Employed by Industry 1950-1960 United States, South and Non-South 18

Table 19. Occupational Distribution of Nonwhites, and Nonwhites as a Percent of Total Employed by Occupation, South and Non-South, 1960 18

Table 20. Annual Average Income of Males 25 Years and Over by Years of School Completed, 1939-1958 . 19

Table 21. Percent Distribution of Income of Families, United States and South by Color, 1954-1961 22

Table 22. Distribution of Income of Families, United States and Eleven Southern States, by Color, 1960 . . 22

Table 23. Distribution of Income of Families of Selected Cities, by Color, 1960 23

Table 24. Distribution of Income of Persons 14 Years and Over with Income for United States and Eleven Southern States by Color, 1950-1960 23

I

Introduction: The State of Optimism

By most measurements, Negroes in the United States appeared to be moving from perennial poverty to relative prosperity at the beginning of the postwar era. Forces at work promised to liberate them from the imbalance that had historically characterized their position in the economy. National economic expansion, technology, and southern economic reorganization had generated new opportunities and higher incomes. There was, in fact, cause for high expectations of basic and accelerated change.

Likewise, the South* had cause to be optimistic. Historically, it had lagged behind the rest of the nation and was generally looked upon as the "nation's number one economic problem," dependent for development upon slow-growth industries and agriculture. The region, since 1940, had been shedding itself of its relative homogeneity of economic structure; it had been moving away from economic backwardness and, as a result of national expansion and reallocation of resources, had been moving toward parity with the rest of the nation.

These developments—southern economic reorganization and improvement in the economic status of Negroes—are two of the principal results of national economic expansion since World War II.

Yet, despite the gains made, both the South and the Negro remain the most depressed segments of the economy and the population. There is some cause for continued optimism about southern economic growth and progress in general. *But there is, in reality, little cause for optimism regarding rapid change in the status of Negroes in the near future.* Unless unforseeable, "revolutionary," changes take place in Negro manpower utilization and development, the Negro citizen will remain the "forgotten man" in America's affluent society.

The situation of southern Negroes is less favorable than that of Negroes in the rest of the nation because the South has failed to extend the benefits of economic progress to them at a rate comparable to those extended to Negroes in other sections of the country. Personal per capita income in the South has quadrupled since 1940, but it is still less than three-fourths that of the rest of the nation. The income of Negro families and individuals nationally has grown over five times since 1940, but it is still little more than one-half that of white families and individuals; and in the South Negro families have an income of less than one-half (46%) that of white families and only one-half the income of their non-southern counterparts.

Gains have been made in employment, but unemployment is twice as extensive among Negro members of the labor force as among whites. Negroes are still concentrated in jobs of the lowest categories, with limited mobility and a high vulnerability to cyclical fluctuations and adverse consequences of technological changes.

Racial discrimination in employment is still as widespread as segregation and discrimination in education. This latter practice, particularly in vocational and technical training, helps to perpetuate a relatively poor job distribution of Negroes.

Thus, while it cannot be denied that important change has occurred in the economic status of Negroes during the past 20 years, critical questions must be considered regarding the rapidity of this change. Basically, the question facing the nation, the South, and Negroes today is whether Negroes are narrowing the gaps in their economic status. The issue is not whether Negroes have been making progress, but whether it has been rapid enough to enable them to adjust to an economy whose rate of change is cumulative and intense. The issue is whether the momentum of change is great enough, and deep enough, to generate an economic base among Negroes which will guarantee their continued movement up the economic ladder.

Traditional patterns of race relations have never worked in the best interest of the economy of the South or of the nation. Indeed, poor race relations have helped to depress growth.* Thus, the manner and extent to which Negroes are absorbed into the economy will strongly determine the pace with which the South reaches parity of income and economic well-being with the nation. Economic progress of the region is increasingly influenced by its urban and racial climate. And, we may add, pressure for change in southern race relations is increasingly generated by forces imbedded in the region's industrial-urban development.

Even this brief examination of southern economic change and the economic status of Negroes will, there-

*Unless otherwise indicated, throughout this report the "South" means the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia. Since Negroes make up about 97% of the nonwhites in the country, census and other data on nonwhites will be considered as applicable to Negroes.

*See William Nicholls, *Southern Tradition and Regional Progress*. Chapel Hill, 1960.

fore, show also why Negroes have stepped up their efforts to speed school desegregation, which, in large part, derives from efforts to secure a better break economically in the nation and in the region. Hopefully, this study may also bring into focus certain aspects of the challenge to the South, if it is to continue its progress.

TABLE 1. NONWHITE POPULATION FOR ELEVEN SOUTHERN STATES, 1950-1960

States	Year		Nonwhite as a Percent of Total Population		Increase or Decrease Nonwhite	Percent of Increase or Decrease Over 1950
	1960	1950	1960	1950	1950-1960	1950-1960
Alabama	983,123	980,950	30.1	32.1	2,173	0.2
Arkansas	390,079	427,555	21.8	22.4	—37,476	—8.8
Florida	887,679	605,254	17.9	21.8	282,425	46.7
Georgia	1,124,898	1,064,890	28.5	31.0	60,018	5.6
Kentucky	217,999	202,560	7.1	6.9	15,439	7.6
Louisiana	1,045,068	885,065	32.1	33.1	160,003	18.1
Mississippi	920,734	991,795	42.3	45.6	—71,061	—7.2
North Carolina	1,156,707	1,078,945	25.4	26.2	77,762	7.2
South Carolina	834,962	824,870	34.9	39.0	7,092	0.9
Tennessee	589,136	531,461	16.4	16.2	57,675	10.9
Virginia	822,426	736,665	20.8	22.2	85,761	11.6

SOURCE: U. S. Department of Commerce, *U. S. Census of Population 1960*, General Social and Economic Characteristics.
U. S. Department of Commerce, *Current Population Reports*, Population Estimates, Series P-25, No. 247, April 2, 1962.

II

Structural Reorganization of the South

Economic progress is best evidenced by upward changes in the real per capita income of individuals (and, to a lesser extent, in the income of families). Income determines the spending and saving power of people, while at the same time it provides a measure of the earning capacity of the whole economy and an indicator of individual contributions to the production of goods and services.

On the other hand, structural changes and economic reorganization are best shown by change in industry sources of employment and income, shifts in occupational distribution of employed persons, growth in "value-added" by manufacturing, and characteristics of population change.

The South Loses Its People

Beyond the size of the population (see Table 1) two aspects of population change are of interest here: the patterns of migration between the South and the non-South; and the patterns of migration between rural-farm areas and the city, both within and outside the South.

In the 1950's, the South's population grew 14%. But Table 2 shows that

—most of this gain, however, resulted from "natural increase," *i.e.*, an excess of births over deaths.

—only in Florida and Virginia was there a migration gain.

—all other southern states had more people moving out than moving in.

—Arkansas and Mississippi exported so many people that the former actually declined in population in the 1950's and the latter was stationary.

—Negroes were leaving the area in larger numbers than whites.

Another depressing fact: the South's export of people included a high proportion of its youth and its well-educated.

For Negroes this is shown by such facts as

—in 1950, 55% of Negroes with four or more years of college were in the South; in 1960, only 48%.

—in 1950, 67% of Negro professional and technical workers were in the South; in 1960, only 48%.

During the decade 1940-50, more than 1.5 million Negroes left the South, and another 1.5 million left during the decade 1950-60. These movements involved Negroes slowed itself after 1950 and began to show a downward trend. In each of the other states, included in Table 2, the upward trend in Negro outmigration continued throughout the 1940-1960 period. Mississippi lost the largest number of Negroes, 326,000, or 30%, between 1940 and 1950, and 323,000, or 32%, between 1950 and 1960.

The movement of Negroes out of the South is both helpful and harmful. By moving out of the South in pursuit of jobs created by national economic expansion, Negroes, as well as whites, find new job opportunities. Simultaneously, the South is being relieved of a sizeable portion of the population which over the years has depended on low-income agriculture for a livelihood.

On the other hand, losses in population drain away much of the best developed and trained manpower, and these losses are from the most productive age group, which has received the benefit of substantial investment by the South in education and training. The loss of these persons from the region is a drain on the economy's human capital.

TABLE 2. POPULATION CHANGE AND TOTAL NET MIGRATION 1950-1960 AND NET MIGRATION OF NONWHITES 1940-1960 FOR ELEVEN SOUTHERN STATES (PERCENT)

State	Total Net Change 1950-1960	Total Net Migration 1950-1960	Net Migration of Nonwhites 1950-1960	Net Migration of Nonwhites 1940-1950
Alabama	+ 6.7	−12.0	−22.8	−20.5
Arkansas	− 6.5	−22.7	−35.0	−32.4
Florida	+78.5	+58.3	+16.6	+ 2.7
Georgia	+14.5	− 6.2	−19.2	−22.2
Kentucky	+ 3.2	−13.2	− 7.6	− 7.9
Louisiana	+21.4	− 1.9	−10.4	−17.0
Mississippi	(a)	−19.9	−32.2	−30.2
North Carolina	+12.2	− 8.1	−19.2	−16.2
South Carolina	+12.5	−10.5	−26.5	−25.3
Tennessee	+ 8.4	− 8.3	−10.7	− 9.2
Virginia	+19.5	+ 0.4	− 9.5	− 3.9

(a) Less than 1 percent.
SOURCE: U. S. Department of Commerce, *Current Population Reports*, Series P-25, No. 247, April 2, 1962.

16% and 14% of the Negroes in the region in each of the two periods respectively. In 1940, 77% of all Negroes in the United States resided in the South compared with 51% today.

The leading exporters of people were Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, and South Carolina.

Patterns of migration by Negroes among southern states have varied. Florida, for example, is the only state which had an excess of inmigration by Negroes over outmigration in both decades since 1940: a 3% net inmigration between 1940 and 1950 and 17% be-between 1950 and 1960 (see Table 2). Georgia and Louisiana are the only states in which outmigration by

Negroes Move to the Central Cities

Another population shift is the movement of people to cities and urban areas, both within and outside the South.

By 1960, three-fourths of the Negroes of Florida were urban dwellers (see Table 3). The proportion in Kentucky and Tennessee was about as high, and in Louisiana three out of five Negroes were urban. By 1960, in only four states—Arkansas, Mississippi, North and South Carolina—did the majority of Negroes live where once they overwhelmingly had: on the land, or close to it.

TABLE 3. DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BETWEEN URBAN AND RURAL FOR ELEVEN STATES BY COLOR, 1950-1960

States	White						Nonwhite					
	1960		1950		Percent Increase or Decrease 1950-60		1960		1950		Percent Increase or Decrease 1950-60	
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural
Alabama	54.2	45.8	42.6	57.4	39.9	−12.2	56.8	43.2	46.2	53.8	+23.1	−19.4
Arkansas	42.4	57.6	32.6	67.4	22.7	−19.2	44.6	55.4	34.2	65.8	+18.6	−23.0
Florida	73.4	26.6	65.5	34.5	111.6	+44.8	76.5	23.5	65.6	34.4	+71.3	+ 1.2
Georgia	54.4	45.6	44.9	55.2	44.1	− 1.9	57.5	42.5	46.8	53.8	+31.4	−16.5
Kentucky	42.5	57.5	34.8	65.2	26.2	− 9.1	70.6	29.4	62.9	37.1	+20.8	−18.6
Louisiana	64.0	36.0	70.3	29.7	12.4	+ 3.1	61.7	38.3	23.5	76.6	+210.7	− 8.6
Mississippi	41.8	58.2	31.5	68.5	40.9	−10.0	32.1	67.9	23.4	76.6	+27.6	−17.7
North Carolina	39.6	60.4	33.6	66.4	34.4	+ 4.1	39.5	60.5	33.5	66.5	+26.4	− 2.5
South Carolina	45.2	54.8	42.0	58.1	29.5	+13.6	33.9	66.1	28.5	71.5	+19.7	− 6.5
Tennessee	48.4	51.6	40.3	59.7	29.7	− 6.8	71.8	28.2	64.1	35.9	+24.1	−12.8
Virginia	56.4	43.6	47.4	52.6	44.9	+ 0.7	53.4	46.8	45.8	58.3	+29.8	− 3.6

SOURCE: U. S. Department of Commerce, *U. S. Census of the Population 1960*, General Social and Economic Characteristics and *1950 U. S. Census of Population*, U. S. Summary, Detailed Characteristics.

The movement of people to the cities and metropolitan areas of the South symbolizes a basic change in the economic structure of the region, sealing an end to the region's traditional economy.

Negroes have also concentrated in the central cities rather than the suburbs. Charles Silberman has suggested that this ranks as one of the great population movements in modern history.* In the last decade, the twelve largest Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas —New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, San Francisco-Oakland, Boston, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, Washington, Cleveland, and Baltimore — lost over two million white residents and gained nearly two million Negro residents, while the central cities of all Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas in the nation had an increase of 3.5 million in the Negro population.

However, the influx of Negroes to the large cities of the North and West should not obscure the fact that Negroes have been moving into southern cities as well.

Between 1950 and 1960, the number of whites in the central cities of the South increased only 26%; the number of Negroes in the central city increased 37%. Whereas just a few years ago the large majority of Negroes lived on farms, today about 72% live in urban areas and about one-half live in the central cities of those urban areas. Table 4 shows population data for selected southern cities.

These patterns underscore the fact that Negroes are becoming more urbanized than whites, in the South as well as in the North. The trends are not as great in the South as in the North, but it is clear that Negroes and whites have been moving in opposite directions, *i.e.*, Negroes toward the central city and whites toward the suburbs.

Population redistribution within the South and between regions reflects the momentum of economic change and opportunity. The greatest single factor underlying population migration is economic, or employment, opportunity. The denial of opportunity to Negroes within the South and the attraction of such opportunity elsewhere has been the major motivation.

Employment and Sources of Income

The principal factor determining the distribution of population over broad regions is economic opportunity and the principal dimension of economic opportunity is employment opportunity.

While farming continues to occupy a big place in southern economic life, its relative role over the past 20 years has decreased. Farm employment declined by about 45% in the South between 1940 and 1960. During the same period manufacturing employment increased 23%, and as a source of income by 27%.

These changes have not only meant more factory jobs in the South. They have also involved diversification in employment. For example, the textile industry, once the backbone of manufacturing in the South and responsible for 25% of all manufacturing employment, is now the source of only 18%. Chemicals, transportation equipment, electrical machinery, and fabricated metals have grown as sources of factory employment, and other non-agriculture industries are increasingly

*See his article, "The City and the Negro," in *Fortune*, March, 1962.

TABLE 4. POPULATION OF SELECTED URBANIZED AREAS BY COLOR, 1950-1960

Urbanized Areas	White				Nonwhite					
	1960	1950	Increase 1950-1960	Percent Increase 1950-1960	1960	Percent Nonwhite of Total	1950	Increase Nonwhite of Total	Increase 1950-1960	Percent Increase 1950-1960
Atlanta	560,124	210,055	350,069	166.7	207,821	27.1	130,055	36.6	86,666	71.5
Birmingham	320,302	195,690	124,612	63.7	201,028	23.2	130,055	39.9	70,973	54.6
Charleston, S. C.*	137,471	96,130	41,341	43.0	78,911	36.5	68,055	41.4	10,856	16.0
Dallas	794,411	395,145	419,266	111.76	137,938	14.8	57,825	13.4	80,113	138.5
Durham*	75,955	67,520	8,435	12.5	36,040	32.2	33,530	33.2	2,510	7.5
Houston	900,817	469,825	430,992	91.7	238,861	21.0	124,760	21.0	114,101	91.5
Jackson, Miss.*	112,093	77,890	34,203	43.1	74,952	40.1	63,830	45.0	11,122	17.4
Little Rock	142,423	78,650	63,773	81.1	42,594	23.0	23,425	23.0	19,169	81.8
Louisville	527,,420	309,940	217,480	70.2	79,239	13.1	57,435	15.6	21,804	38.0
Memphis	344,487	255,273	89,214	35.0	200,018	36.7	150,761	37.1	49,257	32.7
Miami	737,146	208,935	528,211	252.8	115,559	13.6	40,035	16.1	75,524	188.6
Nashville	273,928	200,198	73,736	36.8	72,801	21.0	58,695	22.7	14,106	24.0
New Orleans	579,640	210,055	192,080	49.6	265,597	31.4	181,120	31.9	84,477	46.6
Oklahoma City	385,777	221,195	164,582	74.4	43,411	10.1	20,890	8.6	22,521	107.8
Richmond	238,226	156,625	81,601	52.1	95,212	28.6	73,030	31.8	22,182	30.4

*Cities.

SOURCE: U. S. Department of Commerce, *1950 U. S. Census of Population*, U. S. Summary, Detailed Characteristics, Table 53.
U. S. Census of Population 1960, General Social and Economic Characteristics, by state, Table 72.

providing more and better jobs for southern workers.

Unquestionably, the South has reduced its poverty. Since 1940, the region has made progress toward achieving a balance between its share of the nation's income and its share of the nation's population. The South had one-fifth of the population in 1930 but received only one-tenth of the income; in 1961, although its proportion of the population had remained at about 20%, its share of personal income had advanced from 10 to 15% (see Table 5).

The figures in Table 6 show per capita personal income. Clearly, the progression in the South since 1940 has been greater than for the nation as a whole. Perhaps the most illuminating figures are those on the bottom line: in 1940, southern personal income was only 58% of the national average; by 1962, it had reached 72%.

TABLE 5. INCOME AND POPULATION OF THE SOUTH AS A PERCENT OF THE UNITED STATES, 1930-1961

Year	Population of South as a Percent of Total for U. S.	Income of South as a Percent of Total for U. S.
1961	20.5	15.0
1960	20.6	14.8
1959	20.6	14.9
1958	20.7	14.9
1940	21.4	12.2
1930	20.8	10.2

SOURCE: Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, *Economic Characteristics of the South*, January 1959.
Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, *Statistics on the Growing South*, November 1962.

These indices, as shown in Tables 5 and 6, indicate the economic progress of the South. A different impression is obtained, however, if dollars and cents, rather than percentages, are used.

In 1940 per capita personal income amounted to $595 in the United States as a whole, only $252 more than that of the South. By 1950 the national figure had grown to $1,494, but the South's per capita income was only $1,011, or $482 lower. By 1961, when the national figure had reached $2,263, the South had a per capita income of $1,652, or $611 lower.

In other words, the South has had large growth in personal income and has made impressive gains in the percentage relationship of its income to that of the rest of the nation. *At the same time, there has been an increase in the dollar gap, a gap that is more than twice greater than two decades ago.*

The South is, nevertheless, now experiencing substantial improvements in its well-being. The economic lag which kept the region at the rear of American industrialization is being eroded. But Earl Rauber and Harry Brandt, both of the Atlanta Federal Reserve Bank, placed the "new South" in its best perspective. Rauber put it this way: "for better or worse the inexorable march of economic history has abolished the South as an economic entity." Brandt said, "with the old rural-agriculture economy gone, the Mississippi Delta farmer has less in common with the Atlanta fac-

TABLE 6. PER CAPITA PERSONAL INCOME FOR ELEVEN SOUTHERN STATES, 1940-1962

States	Years				Percent Change		
	1962	1961	1950	1940	1940-1950	1950-1961	1961-1962
Alabama	$1,538	$1,492	$ 869	$ 282	208.2	71.7	3
Arkansas	1,533	1,446	807	256	215.2	79.2	6
Florida	1,997	1,965	1,287	513	150.9	52.7	2
Georgia	1,714	1,645	1,017	340	199.1	62.1	4
Kentucky	1,705	1,633	958	320	199.4	69.6	5
Louisiana	1,715	1,626	1,087	363	199.4	49.6	5
Mississippi	1,382	1,329	733	218	236.2	67.7	4
North Carolina	1,709	1,642	1,013	258	208.5	62.2	4
South Carolina	1,516	1,433	883	307	187.3	62.2	6
Tennessee	1,679	1,605	995	329	192.5	61.2	5
Virginia	2,004	1,908	1,224	466	164.2	56.6	5
UNITED STATES	2,375	2,263	1,491	595	150.6	51.8	4
(1) South*	1,724	1,652	1,011	343	194.8	63.6	4
					Percent Change in Ratio		
South as Percent of U.S.	72.6	73.0	67.7	57.6	1940-1950	1950-1960	1960-1961
					+17.7	+7.8	+56.3

*Eleven States included above plus West Virginia.
SOURCE: 1940-1950, U. S. Department of Commerce, *Personal Income by States, Since 1929*.
1961, *Survey of Current Business*, August, 1962.
1962, *Survey of Current Business*, April, 1963.

tory worker or sales representative than the latter has with his counterparts in the rest of the country."

The region can no longer be characterized by a relatively homogeneous set of basic economic characteristics and pursuits different from those of the rest of the United States. It may be assumed, therefore, that southern economic growth and organization will be constantly linked to patterns of change in the total economy. Therefore, whatever forces shape the economy as a whole will tend to shape the future of the South, particularly if the region will emancipate itself from traditional race relations, a formidable barrier to its economic progress.

III

Negro Gain Has Been Slight

The Negro population of this country has jumped from about 13 to 20 million since 1940, and it has become predominantly urban. The number of Negroes in better paying semi-skilled and white collar jobs has doubled.

These advances have been important because they represent a new beginning and provide the basis for optimism about the continuing economic improvement of the Negro population. Three aspects of the situation should be observed, however, at this point:

(1) Negroes in the South have not shared proportionately in these advances. Differentials in economic progress by Negroes in the South and the non-South persist. They reflect not only the southern lag in general, but also a substantial lag in employment and occupational opportunity for Negroes in the South in comparison with opportunity in other regions.

(2) Not only have the improvements failed to close substantially the historic gap between Negroes and others, but in dollars and cents the position of Negroes has deteriorated.

(3) There are signs which suggest that the momentum underlying improvements in the position of Negroes has not been sufficient to allow Negroes to overcome their marginal position in the work force, nor sufficient to generate change at rates

significant enough to guarantee continuous progress. One of the forces which generated positive change in the position of Negroes in the immediate postwar period was technology. Today it is exerting a negative impact.

Progress appears, at present, to be occurring at a decreasing rate when compared with progress of other Americans. New forces must be vigorously brought into play if the relative gains of the past 20 years are not to be eliminated or wiped out during the immediate years ahead. These forces will have to include intensified training and development of Negro manpower. But, above all, there is a need for vigorous application of public policy in eliminating racial discrimination in education, training, and manpower utilization or employment.

Income: Negroes Running Fast to Stand Still

Income analysis suggests that Negroes are on a treadmill and time is in reality "running out" on them, as a group, in their pursuit of parity with whites. The group has to run exceptionally fast in order to stand still. And Negroes in the South have more difficulty in sustaining their relative and absolute positions than those in other sections of the country.

Undoubtedly the position of Negroes as income recipients and consumers has improved. Three times more Negroes were employed in 1960 than in 1940 in income producing, non-agriculture jobs; thus there are more Negroes with money. Change has occurred in the distribution of income among Negroes, and the huge migration of the Negro population from rural to urban areas and to the central cities has resulted in a large concentration of Negro purchasing power in these areas.

For example, Table 7 sets forth estimates of participation in retail sales by Negroes in ten cities, ranging from $26 million, or 21% of the total, in Durham to $512 million, or 15%, in Houston. In none of these cities did Negroes represent this much sales volume 20 years ago. This is not only suggestive of the impact of aggregate and concentrated purchasing power in the Negro market, but it is also indicative of the kind of economic potential to which southern race relations must adjust.

Not only are there more Negroes with income, but also, in comparison with 20 years ago, fewer of them are in the lowest income brackets and more of them are in the middle and upper income categories. Obviously, this suggests a higher participation by Negroes in the market place.

For example, Table 8 shows a tripling in the proportion of Negro families with incomes between $4,000 and $6,000 between 1945 and 1961, while the number

TABLE 7. ESTIMATED PURCHASING POWER OF NEGROES IN TEN SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS, 1961

Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area	Total Retail Sale Estimate	Estimated Negro Participation*	Percent Negro
Atlanta	$1,800,000,000	$324,000,000	17.0
Birmingham	897,000,000	296,000,000	33.0
Durham	125,000,000	26,000,000	21.0
Charleston, S. C.	230,000,000	69,000,000	30.0
Houston	3,000,000,000	512,000,000	15.0
Miami	1,700,000,000	153,000,000	9.0
New Orleans	1,300,000,000	312,000,000	24.0
Nashville	610,000,000	91,000,000	15.0
Memphis	830,000,000	224,000,000	24.0
Richmond	790,000,000	142,000,000	18.0

*Estimate of retail sales made to Negroes residing in central trading areas of Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area; includes Negroes from contiguous counties or total metro area.

SOURCE: U. S. Census of Population and Housing 1960, Census Tracts. U. S. Department of Commerce, 1958 Bureau of Census. J. Walter Thompson Company, *Population and Its Distribution*, The United States Markets, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961).

of families with income over $6,000 has grown from 4% to 20% of the total during the same period. These gains are impressive, but

- —the rate of participation in the labor force of Negro women and younger people is much higher than among whites;
- —60% of the Negro families in this country today still have incomes of less than $4,000 annually, compared with 20% of the white families;*
- —white families are abandoning the lower income brackets at a much faster rate than Negroes (a decline of 63% for whites and 33% for Negroes);
- —Negroes are reaching the higher income brackets at a slower rate than whites.

Moreover, about 75% of the Negro families in the United States have incomes less than the median income of $5,981 for white families (see Table 10).

Beginning in 1940, the income of Negroes grew at unprecedented rates. It was marked by a growth of approximately 700% in aggregate personal income between 1939 and 1961, an income which is now estimated to be well over $22 billion per year, 5% of the personal income of the nation. In direct contrast to the situation before 1940, when Negroes as income recipients, or consumers, commanded little or no respect in the national and regional economy, they have since 1945 attracted serious competitive attention in the market places of the nation. The power of the Negro market has meaning in the area of race relations, as a "new" force underlying efforts on the part of Negroes

*See also the more detailed Tables D1, D2, D3, and D4 in the Appendix.

TABLE 8. PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF INCOME OF FAMILIES BY COLOR FOR UNITED STATES, 1945-1961

Total Money Income Level	1961		1945		Percent Increase or Decrease in Rate Over 1945	
	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite
Per Cent	100	100	100	100		
Under $4,000	27.7	60.3	73.3	90.1	−62.3	−33.1
$4,000-$9,999	55.4	33.7	14.8	6.1	+90.3	+233.0
$10,000 and Over	16.9	10.1	7.7	3.8	+119.5	+429.0

SOURCE: U. S. Department of Commerce, *Current Population Reports*, Consumer Income, Series P-60, No. 3, March 5, 1962 and No. 38, August 28, 1962.

to eliminate discrimination and segregation and obtain better employment in retail trade, industry, and finance.

But, *Negroes made their greatest income gains between 1940 and 1954. Since 1954, they have not progressed in income as well.*

In 1939, for example, the median wage and salary income of Negro males was $460, the equivalent of 41% that of white males. Between then and 1955, Negro men substantially gained. Since 1955, Negro males have barely held on to those gains, losing, as Table 9 shows, 3.5 percentage points between 1955 and 1957 and gaining only one point between 1955 and 1960. As of 1960, the wage and salary income of Negro males was still only three-fifths that of white males, just about the same as in 1955 when progress toward closing the income gap between Negroes and whites began to level off.

Similar developments occurred regarding family income. As shown in Table 10, Negro families and unrelated individuals gained 19% on white families and individuals between 1940 and 1955, moving from a ratio of 37% to 56%. Since the beginning of 1955, the percentage relationship has just barely held its own, dropping 5.3 points between 1954 nd 1959, reversing itself in 1960 and again reaching 56%, and dropping again in 1961 to 52%.

Two characteristics stand out. Onthe one hand, relative growth in wage and salary income of Negroes since 1940 has been greater than that of whites; on the other hand, the absolute, or *dollar*, difference has widened considerably.

White males have stretched the "dollar gap" between their earnings and that of Negroes over three times since 1939. White families similarly have increased the differential between their employment income and that of Negro families.

People spend and save dollars. It is this dollar difference that counts. Pronouncements regarding economic progress which are confused to acceleration concepts and percentage change obscure the real predica-

TABLE 9. MEDIAN WAGE AND SALARY INCOME OF PERSONS 14 YEARS AND OVER WITH WAGE AND SALARY INCOME BY COLOR AND SEX FOR SELECTED YEARS, 1939-1960

Color and Sex	Year						Percent Change 1939-1960	
	1960	1958	1957	1955	1954	1939		
White								
Male	$5,137	$4,869	$4,896	$3,986	$3,734	$1,113	+361	
Female	3,007	2,864	2,648	2,260	2,046	674	+273	
Nonwhite								
Male	2,975	2,655	2,926	2,542	2,151	460	+548	
Female	1,574	1,600	1,519	894	914	346	+318	
Percent Nonwhite of White							Percent Change in Ratio	
Male	59.8	58.8	59.6	59.8	56.8	41.3	+44.8	
Female	52.3	49.6	48.3	40.3	44.7	58.7	+39.7	
Dollar Differences Between White and Nonwhite							Increase 1939-1960	
Male	−$2,162	−$1,917	−$1,969	−$1,444	−$1,583	−$653	+$1,410	+216 percent
Female	−$1,361	−$1,287	−$1,231	−$1,171	−$1,132	−$408	+$1,231	+193 percent

SOURCE: U. S. Department of Commerce, *Current Population Reports*, Series P-60, No. 31, January 17, 1960; Table 01 No. 33, September 20, 1957; No. 29, November 1956; Table 13, No. 24, October 1955; Table 21.

TABLE 10. MEDIAN WAGE OR SALARY INCOME OF PRIMARY FAMILIES AND UNRELATED INDIVIDUALS WITH WAGE AND SALARY INCOME BY COLOR, 1940-1961

Families and Individuals	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1954	1953	1954	1953	1950	1940
White	$5,570	$5,434	$5,252	$4,882	$4,831	$4,663	$4,331	$4,150	$4,301	$3,075	$1,233
Nonwhite	3,908	3,858	3,672	3,437	3,536	3,439	3,418	3,333	3,257	1,671	489
Dollar Difference Between Whites and Nonwhites	−1,662	−1,576	−1,580	−1,445	−1,295	−1,256	−1,113	−1,817	−1,944	−1,519	− 834
Nonwhite Income as a Percent of White	53.2	54.3	50.9	49.9	52.5	51.8	55.8	56.3	56.1	49.3	37.8
Percent Change in Ratio	1959-1960		1940-1960		1957-1959		1953-1957		1950-1953		1940-1950
	+14.1		+33.3		−3.0		−6.4		+13.8		+33.3

SOURCE: U. S. Department of Commerce, *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, 1962.
U. S. Department of Commerce, *Current Population Reports*, Series P-60, No. 37, No. 33, January 15, 1960, No. 37, January 17, 1963, No. 38, August 28, 1962, No. 27, Table 15 No. 39, Table 22 dated February 28, 1963.

ment—*Negroes are losing ground rapidly in gaining dollar parity with whites.* The "dollar gap" trend shown in Tables 9 and 10 means very simply that earnings are increasing for whites at a faster pace than for Negroes.

This is explained in two ways. First, earnings of Negroes have been low over a long period of time. Thus, a smaller gain yields a striking percentage increase. The second explanation is more serious. Notwithstanding their real gains, Negroes are not finding enough jobs in areas where wages and salaries tend to be higher and to increase faster.

Whites are acquiring the highest paying jobs in the higher occupational classifications. The benefits of general economic expansion and technology, therefore, have only "trickled down" to the Negroes, putting more of them into wage and salary jobs. These benefits automatically produced high acceleration in income change, but were restricted tightly to lower occupational classifications.

Thus, despite the unprecedented growth of income among Negroes and the percentage gains made, the fact remains that income progress of Negroes has leveled off. The percent of Negro families in lower income brackets is twice as high as whites, and the differential in earnings of whites and Negroes continues to widen, largely offsetting percentage gains. Accordingly, it is still difficult for Negroes to purchase health, education, and the amenities of life on the same level as other members of the population.

Southern Negroes at the Bottom of Economic Ladder

The individual income of Negroes in the South is only two-fifths that of comparable whites. In other regions, the income of Negro citizens is about three-fourths and that of whites (see Table 11).

The table also shows that southern Negroes have incomes of about two-fifth that of non-southern Ne-

TABLE 11. MEDIAN INCOME OF PERSONS 14 YEARS AND OVER WITH INCOME BY REGION AND COLOR, 1950-1960

	1960				1950			
Region	*White*	*Nonwhite*	*Dollar Difference White and Nonwhite*	*Nonwhite Percent of White*	*White*	*Nonwhite*	*Dollar Difference White and Nonwhite*	*Nonwhite Percent of White*
Northeast	$3,304	$2,441	−$ 863	73.9	$3,246	$1,653	−$594	73.3
North Central	3,090	2,363	− 827	73.2	3,143	1,652	− 491	77.1
South*	2,473	995	− 1,478	40.2	1,647	739	− 908	44.9
West	3,298	2,474	− 824	75.0	3,114	1,445	− 669	68.9

SOUTH AS A PERCENT OF OTHER REGIONS

	1960		1950	
Northeast	74.8	40.8	73.3	43.6
North Central	80.0	44.2	76.9	44.7
West	74.9	40.2	77.9	51.1

*Includes Maryland, Delaware, Texas, Oklahoma, West Virginia, and District of Columbia.
SOURCE: 1960, U. S. Department of Commerce, *U. S. Census of Population 1960*, U. S. Summary, General Social and Economic Characteristics, Table 185.
1950, U. S. Department of Commerce, *1950 U. S. Census of Population*, U. S. Summary, Detailed Characteristics, Table 170 and Table 91.

groes (females in the South, incidentally, do slightly better). On the other hand, white persons in the South have incomes close to four-fifths that of white persons in the non-South.

The family income situation is slightly better for Negroes. But here, also, the non-southern Negro family enjoys an income at least 50% greater than that of its southern counterpart (see Table 12 and, for more detail, Table 13).

Table 14 shows that in 1960 there was $1,522 separating the median incomes of whites and non-white persons in this country; in 1950, the difference had been only $1,080. Negroes had fallen farther behind. In the South, the 1960 median income of Negroes was $1,478 below that of whites; in 1950, the difference had been only $908. Negroes had fallen farther behind.

In only one southern state, Florida, have the earnings of Negro male workers gained in relation to those of white male workers (see Table 15). In each of the other ten states, not only did the dollar gap increase, but Negroes also lost percentage ground, ranging from a 6% negative change in Virginia to a 25% negative change in Arkansas for male *workers;* and a negative change in the income of all *persons* (see Table 14) ranging from a low 7% in Georgia to 21% in Tennessee. In other words, although Negro income between 1950-60 increased sharply, the gap between white and Negro income was growing.

It seems clear that Negroes in the South have not kept pace with the income progress of the region, and that little change is occurring in their income position vis-a-vis non-southern Negroes.

One may conclude, therefore, that unless greater efforts are vigorously applied to absorb Negroes into the industrial-commercial life of the urban South these trends will continue. They suggest that, in the ab-

TABLE 12. MEDIAN INCOME OF FAMILIES WITH INCOME BY REGION AND COLOR, 1960

	White	Nonwhite	Percent Nonwhite of White	Dollar Difference White and Nonwhite
Northeast	$6,518	$4,571	69.3	−$1,947
North Central	5,994	4,371	72.9	−$1,624
South*	5,009	3,533	66.4	−$1,667
West	6,444	4,937	76.6	−$1,507
Percent South of:				
Northeast	79.2	83.4		
North Central	83.6	88.8		
West	77.7	67.8		

SOURCE: U. S. Department of Commerce, *U. S. Census of Population 1960*, U. S. Summary, General Social and Economic Characteristics.
*South includes Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Oklahoma, Texas, and West Virginia.

TABLE 13. MEDIAN INCOME OF WHITE AND NONWHITE FAMILIES FOR ELEVEN SOUTHERN STATES, 1950-1960

	1960			1950			Percent Change 1950-1960	
State	White	Nonwhite	Percent Nonwhite of White	White	Nonwhite	Percent Nonwhite of White	Increase or Decrease	Ratio
Alabama	$4,764	$3,009	61.8	$2,856	$ 882	43.0	+137.7	−3.7
Arkansas	3,678	1,836	44.4	1,571	726	46.2	+153	−3.8
Florida	5,147	3,798	54.4	3,333	1,444	49.2	+244.5	+1.5
Georgia	3,857	3,188	42.5	3,139	989	43.1	+240.7	+2.2
Kentucky	4,193	2,370	61.3	1,856	1,110	59.8	+221.2	+2.2
Louisiana	3,388	3,338	42.8	3,434	1,853	43.8	+216.7	No Change
Mississippi	4,309	1,444	34.2	1,614	691	37.2	+240	−7.7
North Carolina	4,288	1,993	42.4	2,215	1,056	47.6	+188.6	−4.8
South Carolina	4,893	1,699	34.7	2,291	790	35.0	+215	+5.1
Tennessee	4,533	2,592	52.9	1,946	1,186	56.9	+207.2	−4.2
Virginia	5,523	3,780	58.3	3,219	1,533	48.9	+235	+5.9
United States	5,424	3,058	56.3					
South*	5,009	3,533	66.4					

SOURCE: U. S. Department of Commerce, *1950 U. S. Census of Population*, U. S. Summary Detailed.
U. S. Census of Population 1960, U. S. Summary, General Social and Economic Characteristics.
*Includes Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Oklahoma, Texas, and West Virginia.

TABLE 14. MEDIAN INCOME OF WHITE AND NONWHITE PERSONS FOURTEEN YEARS AND OVER FOR ELEVEN STATES, SOUTH, AND UNITED STATES, 1950-1960

State	1960			1950			Percent Change	
	White	Nonwhite	Percent Nonwhite of White	White	Nonwhite	Percent Nonwhite of White	Nonwhite Increase	Ratio of Nonwhites to Whites
Alabama	$3,371	$ 866	36.5	$1,455	$614	42.2	+40.6	−13.7
Arkansas	1,798	715	39.8	1,117	487	43.6	+46.2	− 7.8
Florida	3,434	1,332	51.3	1,727	847	48.2	+59.6	− 6.2
Georgia	3,470	937	37.5	1,515	619	40.3	+51.5	− 6.9
Kentucky	3,081	1,159	54.3	1,411	863	61.1	+34.0	−11.1
Louisiana	3,799	1,081	35.8	1,767	774	43.8	+39.7	−18.2
Mississippi	3,757	898	35.2	1,536	429	35.2	+47.1	− 9.0
North Carolina	3,035	1,286	42.4	1,875	999	53.4	+28.7	−20.5
South Carolina	3,447	742	38.5	1,684	555	31.9	+41.3	− 5.0
Tennessee	3,117	983	46.4	1,574	799	50.6	+23.1	−20.8
Virginia	3,763	1,247	42.1	1,880	919	48.9	+35.7	− 7.8
South*	3,473	993	40.2	1,647	739	44.9	+34.4	−10.6
United States	3,824	1,882	49.7	2,858	978	47.6		

SOURCE: U. S. Department of Commerce, 1960 *U. S. Census of Population*, Detailed Characteristics.
U. S. Census of Population 1950, U. S. Summary, General Social and Economic Characteristics.
*Includes Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Oklahoma, Texas, and West Virginia.

TABLE 15. MEDIAN INCOME OF WHITE AND NONWHITE MALE WORKERS FOR ELEVEN SOUTHERN STATES, 1950-1960

State	1960			1950			Percent	
	White	Nonwhite	Nonwhite as Percent of White	White	Nonwhite	Nonwhite as Percent of White	Nonwhite Increase	Change in Ratio of Nonwhites to Whites 1950-1960
Alabama	$3,347	$1,417	42.3	$1,859	$ 956	51.4	+48	−20
Arkansas	3,486	993	28.5	1,453	759	52.2	+30.8	−23.1
Florida	3,743	2,073	55.4	2,339	1,165	52.9	+74.8	+ 4.8
Georgia	3,574	1,489	44.1	1,870	919	49.1	+62.0	−10.0
Kentucky	3,958	1,764	48.2	1,701	1,199	70.6	+47.1	−14.4
Louisiana	4,001	1,262	29.1	2,258	997	44.8	+26.5	−14.4
Mississippi	3,737	890	23.2	1,462	688	47.4	+29.1	−21.9
North Carolina	3,553	1,286	42.4	1,875	999	53.4	+28.7	−20.6
South Carolina	3,795	1,135	28.2	2,042	801	39.2	+41.7	− 9.4
Tennessee	3,922	1,298	34.2	1,688	1,143	67.2	+13.5	−19.4
Virginia	3,734	1,986	51.8	2,512	1,221	54.1	+62.7	− 5.3

SOURCE: U. S. Department of Commerce, 1960 *U. S. Census of Population*, U. S. Summary, Detailed Characteristics.
U. S. Census of Population 1950, U. S. Summary, General Social and Economic Characteristics.

state of better economic opportunity, loss through the migration of Negro manpower will continue.

Employment, Occupations, and Manpower Utilization

Four other factors exert a marked influence on the position of Negroes in the non-agriculture labor market. They are:

—technology;
—the degree of competition from whites;
—the quality and kind of education received as part of manpower development; and
—public policy regarding the elimination of racial discrimination in education, employment, and occupations.

The last factor is assuming a more important function as a result of court decisions to desegregate education and increases in "fair employment practices" programs at local, state, and federal levels.

Change in technology and manpower requirements and the changing patterns of industry expansion suggest that Negroes can no longer depend upon the forces of national economic expansion and technology to gen-

erate improvements in employment opportunity. Technology alone has drastically changed the kind of manpower needed by manufacturing industries. The need for unskilled workers has declined, whereas the demand for workers with skills and training has increased. This trend, coupled with a relatively slow pace of manpower development among Negroes, places them in an unfavorable position when it comes to supplying persons with skills who can compete favorably in today's labor markets.

Between 1947 and 1961, the number of employees in mining, manufacturing, contract construction, and agriculture decreased, while the number of employees absorbed by wholesaling and retailing, insurance, finance, the so-called services, and government increased. *Noteworthy is the fact that the industries with a declining rate of employment are the industries which have absorbed Negroes.* Actually, the source of improvement in the economic status of Negroes during past years has been their movement out of agriculture into mining, manufacturing, and construction where they found unskilled and semi-skilled jobs as laborers and operatives. These are the industries which since 1957 have had either declining employment or relatively little growth in employment. Excluding government, the areas of growth in employment are not the areas in which Negroes have traditionally found employment.

The second general development involves a shift in employment from plant to office in manufacturing industries. Between 1950 and 1961, the number of persons employed in manufacturing increased by more than one million while the number of production workers declined by almost one-half million. This means that increases in manufacturing employment were in non-plant and non-production jobs, a shift, in other words, to office work and white collar jobs, areas of employment which have never absorbed many Negroes.

Increased use of labor saving devices—"automation"—means that employment opportunity in semi-skilled and unskilled work will continue to decline. It will, therefore, become increasingly difficult for Negroes to attain higher or even retain previous levels of employment in those occupations and industries which they had penetrated during the 1940's and 1950's.

Unemployment among Negroes today amounts to more than 10%, twice that of whites. In heavily industrialized areas such as Chicago and Detroit, the differential is even more striking. *Furthermore, the duration of unemployment is longer for Negroes than for whites.*

In September 1958 the average duration of unemployment for Negroes was 17.8 weeks and for white workers 13.3 weeks. The average length of unemployment in September 1962 for Negroes was 18.0 weeks while that for whites had dropped to 13.0 weeks. Negroes accounted for about one-fourth of all the long term unemployed, but for only about 11% of the labor force. About 29% of the very long term unemployed in September 1962 were Negroes compared with 21% in September 1961. Long term joblessness among Negroes results from discrimination in hiring and inadequate training and inadequate manpower development.

Since 1940, white collar employment among Negro males has gone up 144% and blue collar skilled and semi-skilled employment by 101% in contrast to 31% and 14% among whites in the respective groups. In the same period, Negro females employed in white collar positions increased by 169% and in blue collar positions by 132% in comparison with a white increase of 18% in white collar jobs and a decline of 23% in the number represented in blue collar occupations.

TABLE 16. NONWHITE EMPLOYMENT AS PERCENT OF TOTAL EMPLOYMENT IN EACH MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUP, BY SEX, APRIL 1940 AND APRIL 1960

Major Occupation Group	Nonwhite Men as Percent of All Men		Increase or Decrease in Percent	Nonwhite Women as Percent of All Women		Increase or Decrease in Percent
	1940	1960	1940-1960	1940	1960	1940-1960
Total Employed	9.0	9.3		13.9	13.6	
Professional, Technical, and Kindred Workers	3.1	3.5	+0.5	4.6	5.6	+ 1.0
Managers, Officials, and Proprietors except Farm	1.5	1.9	+0.4	2.8	4.8	+ 2.0
Clerical and Kindred Workers	1.6	6.7	+5.1	0.7	3.8	+ 3.1
Sales Workers	1.4	3.8	+1.6	1.1	2.4	+ 1.3
Craftsmen, Foremen, and Kindred Workers	2.7	4.4	+1.7	2.3	8.0	+ 5.7
Operatives and Kindred Workers	6.1	11.6	+5.5	5.0	12.4	+ 7.4
Laborers, except farm and Mine	21.2	27.6	+6.4	*	*	
Service workers, except Private Household	17.4	21.1	+3.7	13.1	19.2	+ 6.1
Private Household	(1)	(1)		46.5	47.5	+ 1.0
Farmers and Farm Managers	13.1	8.6	—4.5	30.2	16.4	—13.8
Farm Laborers and Foremen	22.5	23.6	+1.1	62.9	22.6	—40.3

*Not Available.

SOURCE: U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, and U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

These percentage gains are impressive, but the fact remains that Negroes have penetrated only to a limited extent job categories above semi-skilled levels.

For example (see Table 16), Negro females make up 12.6% of the total females employed, but they comprise almost one-half, 48%, of all the domestic servants in the economy and only 2% of all the sales workers; this is not substantially different from the situation in 1940. Negro males comprise slightly in excess of 9% of the employed males in the economy, but they are only 2% of the total number of men employed as nonfarm managers, proprietors, and officials, only fourtenths of a percentage point better than the situation in 1940. Yet they are 28% of the laborers.

Table 17 shows similar data for the South only. *There has not been a large penetration by Negroes into the growth sectors of employment. Those industries and occupations where Negroes have gained in employment represent the slow growth areas of the economy and labor market.*

It has already been suggested that regional differences in employment account in large measure for differences between the income of Negroes in the South and in the rest of the nation, as well as for high rates of migration by Negroes from southern states. Indeed, in none of the major industry categories shown in Table 18 do Negroes in the South keep pace with Negroes in the non-South. Study the last column of Table 18. In every category except "government" Negroes had a smaller share of the jobs in 1960 than in 1950 in the South. Of course there were fewer Negroes living in the South in 1960. But this is a chicken and the egg question. Fewer jobs because of fewer people? Or did people leave because jobs were not there?

But the fact is, Negroes make up only slightly less of the southern labor force today, 19%, than they did a decade ago, when they were 21% of the labor force. In each area of industry employment, the decline in Negro employment exceeds the decline in the Negro labor force.

Table 19 shows how Negroes are represented in various job categories. These tables reveal important contrasts between the percent of the total labor force and the percent of occupations held by Negroes.

We see, for example, in Table 19 that
—in the non-South, 6% of the employed Negroes are in professional and technical positions;
—of all professional and technical positions, Negroes hold only 3%;
—in the South, the percentages are 5 and 9.

We also see that Negroes of the South have almost all the household jobs and nearly half of the laborers jobs, both on and off the farm. We see that very few of the clerical and sales jobs are held by Negroes either in or out of the South. In the non-South, however, a good percentage of employed Negroes (10%) are in clerical spots, whereas only 3% of the employed Negroes in the South are so employed.

TABLE 17. DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYED PERSONS IN THE SOUTH* BY COLOR AND SEX AND MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUPS, 1950-1960 (PERCENT)

Occupation Group	White				Nonwhite			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
	1960	1950	1960	1950	1960	1950	1960	1950
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
WHITE COLLAR OCCUPATIONS	36.9	30.9	59.8	58.8	8.3	5.8	13.2	10.6
Professional, Technical and Related Workers	10.0	6.8	14.0	13.3	2.9	2.0	7.5	6.2
Managers, Proprietors, Officials, Nonfarm	12.6	11.4	4.7	3.4	1.5	1.4	1.0	1.2
Clerical and Related Workers	6.6	5.8	31.5	29.3	2.9	1.6	3.6	2.2
Sales Workers	7.7	6.9	9.6	10.8	1.0	0.8	1.1	1.0
BLUE COLLAR OCCUPATIONS	39.7	36.7	18.6	20.6	30.8	24.6	9.0	9.6
Craftsmen, Foremen (Skilled)	20.5	18.3	1.2	1.3	8.6	6.3	0.4	0.3
Operatives (Semi-skilled)	19.2	18.4	17.0	19.3	22.2	18.3	8.6	9.3
UNSKILLED LABOR AND SERVICE OCCUPATIONS	9.8	9.8	15.1	13.8	36.3	34.3	66.4	64.0
Laborers (Unskilled) Except Farm and Mine	5.2	5.7	0.4	0.5	22.9	23.3	0.9	1.6
Service Workers Except Household	4.0	3.5	11.3	10.4	12.6	10.1	20.8	17.7
Private Household Workers	0.6	0.6	3.4	2.9	0.8	0.9	44.7	44.7
FARM OCCUPATIONS	10.2	21.5	1.7	2.8	18.6	33.8	5.9	13.9
Farmers and Farm Managers	7.2	15.5	0.7	0.9	7.2	19.3	1.0	2.5
Farm Laborers and Foremen	3.0	6.0	1.0	2.9	11.4	14.5	4.9	11.4
OCCUPATIONS NOT REPORTED	4.0	1.3	5.2	2.9	5.9	1.3	5.6	1.7

*Includes Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Oklahoma, Texas, and West Virginia.

SOURCE: U. S. Department of Commerce.
1950 U. S. Census of Population, Detailed Characteristics 216158.
U. S. Census of Population, 1960, General Social and Economic Characteristics—216103.

In sum, it appears that penertation of higher echelons of the occupational scale by Negroes has been relatively limited, and much more so in the South than outside the region. Negroes have entered the mainstream of industrial and civil employment in non-southern communities to a greater degree than in the South. In so doing, they have filled jobs which make possible upgrading, training opportunity, and increased earning power on the basis of personal job qualifications. In the South, Negroes have not shared equitably in the rapid industrial expansion of the past two decades.

TABLE 18. NONWHITES AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL PERSONS EMPLOYED BY INDUSTRY, 1950-1960, UNITED STATES, SOUTH AND NON-SOUTH

	United States			Non-South			South*		
	1950	1960	Percent Change in Ratio 1950-60	1950	1960	Percent Change in Ratio 1950-60	1950	1960	Percent Change in Ratio 1950-60
Agriculture	15.6	14.2	— 8.9	2.8	2.8	0.	30.8	30.1	— 2.3
Mining	4.5	3.2	—28.9	3.5	2.1	—40.0	8.4	5.1	—39.2
Construction	5.5	8.5	+54.5	5.6	5.4	— 3.6	17.7	16.9	— 4.5
Manufacturing	6.5	6.8	+ 4.6	4.7	5.4	+14.9	16.4	12.9	—21.3
Transportation	7.6	7.7	+ 1.3	5.2	5.9	+ 1.3	16.1	13.9	—13.7
Trade	6.3	7.0	+11.1	4.2	5.2	+23.8	13.2	12.8	— 3.0
Finance	4.6	4.2	— 4.3	3.8	3.7	— 2.6	9.1	6.6	—21.4
Service	17.1	16.9	— 1.2	11.6	12.1	+ 4.3	36.0	32.4	—10.4
Government	7.9	10.0	+26.5	5.8	8.4	+44.8	10.8	11.6	+ 7.4

*Includes Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Oklahoma, Texas, and West Virginia.

SOURCE: U. S. Department of Commerce, *1950 Census of Population*, U. S. Summary, Detailed Characteristics Table 16; *Census of Population 1960*, U. S. Summary, General Social and Economic Characteristics Table 103.

TABLE 19. OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF NONWHITES AND NONWHITES AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL EMPLOYED BY OCCUPATION, SOUTH AND NON-SOUTH, 1960

	Non-South		South*	
	Percent Nonwhite of Total Employed in Occupation	Percent Nonwhite of Total Nonwhite	Percent Nonwhite of Total Employed in Occupation	Percent Nonwhite of Total Nonwhite
Total Employed	6.6	100.00	19.2	100.00
Professional and Technical	3.4	6.0	9.2	4.8
Managers, Officials, and Proprietors	2.0	2.5	2.9	1.3
Clerical	4.4	10.1	5.0	3.2
Sales	2.1	2.3	2.8	1.0
Craftsmen, Foremen	3.7	7.7	8.1	5.3
Operatives	7.9	22.2	17.8	16.8
Private Household Workers	30.4	9.0	79.8	18.3
Service Workers	13.3	17.2	37.4	15.9
Farm Laborers	6.0	1.5	47.4	8.8
Farmers and Farm Managers	1.5	0.8	17.9	4.7
Laborers	14.5	9.7	47.6	14.1
Not Reported	14.6	11.1	24.0	5.8

SOURCE: U. S. Department of Commerce, *U. S. Census of Population 1960*, General Social and Economic Characteristics, Table 103 by State.
*Includes Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Oklahoma, Texas, and West Virginia.

IV

What Price Discrimination?

An attempt has been made to show the position of Negroes in the economy of the nation and the South. Emerging from the presentation are several implications, a few of which will be dealt with as a conclusion to this report.

Education

Employment determines income; the level of income is related to the kind of job one is able to obtain; and jobs are related to education and training. Thus, to a great degree, the ability of Negroes to pass from poverty and deprivation to parity with the rest of the population depends not only upon removing barriers to employment and occupational mobility. It also depends upon better education through increased school desegregation and upon rapid adjustments and improvements in the process of Negro manpower development (see Table 20).

TABLE 20. ANNUAL AVERAGE INCOME OF MALES 25 YEARS AND OVER BY YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED, 1939-1958

Year of School Completed	Annual Average Income			
	1939	1946	1949	1958
Elementary:	$1,036	$2,041	$2,394	$3,096
Less Than 8 Years	*	1,738	2,062	2,551
8 Years	*	2,327	2,829	3,769
High School:				
1 to 3 Years	1,379	2,449	3,226	4,618
4 Years	1,661	2,939	3,784	5,567
College:				
1 to 3 Years	1,931	3,654	4,423	6,966
4 Years or More	2,607	4,527	8,490	9,206

SOURCE: U. S. Department of Commerce *Statistical Abstract of the United States 1962.*

Not all present underemployment of Negroes can be attributed to discriminatory employment practices; limited opportunities are sometimes available to Negroes for which few exhibit any interest or can qualify. Nevertheless, Negroes face a two-pronged problem: discrimination in employment on one hand and, on the other, an inadequate flow of manpower to meet such limited opportunities as there are. This inadequacy is a cumulative product of segregation in education and manpower development and utilization. This is nowhere more true than in vocational and technical training.

Generally, vocational training available to Negroes is limited mainly to those occupations in which they have traditionally found employment: in the industrial trades, some of which are becoming obsolete, and in those areas where Negroes provide services to Negroes, such as barbering. Technical courses in electronics and tool design, the apprenticeable trades such as plumbing, steamfitting, and sheet metal work, and courses in blueprint reading and welding, are usually not available to Negroes.

Contrast between programs to develop white and Negro manpower can be seen by the course offerings of three southern metropolitan school systems: Atlanta, Houston, and Nashville.

Houston

In the only vocational and technical high school in the Houston Independent School System, an all white school, full three year courses are offered in: air conditioning and refrigeration mechanics, automobile mechanics, drafting, machine shop, photography, radio and television, and welding. None of these courses is taught in the five Negro schools.

Negroes are offered two years of training in commercial cooking and baking, cleaning and

pressing, and trade dressmaking, courses which are not taught in white schools.

Nashville

The only vocational and technical high school in Nashville is an all-white institution. Full courses are offered in commercial art, drafting, auto mechanics, electricity, general clerical, industrial chemistry, machine shop, refrigeration, secretarial training, and office machines; adult evening courses are taught in such areas as sheet metal layout, pipe-fitting, machine shop, welding, aircraft blueprint reading, electronics for office machines, and advanced projection.

Courses offered to Negroes (in only one of the four high schools) throughout the county are auto mechanics, commerce, cosmetology, tailoring, trowel trades, and woodworking. Evening courses are taught in sewing, millinery, auto mechanics, cosmetology, tailoring, trowel trades, and electronics.

Atlanta

The white vocational and technical school in Atlanta is the Smith-Hughes School.* Courses are offered in electronics, tool and die design, instrumentation, machine shop, refrigeration and air conditioning, electricity, iron-working, steamfitting, plumbing, sheet metal, tool and die making, blueprint reading and drafting, gas fitting, and welding.

Negroes are offered at Carver Vocational School radio and television, industrial sewing, commercial cooking, short order cooking, shoe repairing, auto mechanics, tailoring, bricklaying, drycleaning, practical nursing, and catering.

The contrasts are obvious. Ninety percent of the Negro youth and 80% of the white youth do not go to college. Vocational and technical training at pre-college levels is a real concern. Neglecting the education of the majority of youth who do not go to college will reflect itself most seriously among Negroes, the group most vulnerable to unemployment and automation, because of the imbalance in job development and preparation. We do not need poor quality vocational and technical training programs which serve as dumping grounds for problem students, nor programs that prepare Negro youth for "traditional Negro jobs." We need vocational programs that give sound background in mathematics, science, and other academic subjects, as well as developing marketable skills.

Jobs for laborers and unskilled workers will undoubtedly be considerably reduced by 1970. On the other hand, the economy may well demand, according to some estimates,

—80% more managers
—25% more clerical personnel
—25% more sales personnel
—25% more banking, finance, and insurance personnel
—more blueprint readers, computer operators, metallurgical technicians, machine tool operators, industrial chemists, key punch and machine operators, and other highly skilled people.

But

—no increase is expected in the demand for laborers, and the demand for semi-skilled workers is not expected to rise above 15%.

Restricted vocational and technical training for Negroes is justified by southern school boards on the grounds that jobs in the crafts and technical areas as well as in sales, clerical, and other white collar positions are not generally open to Negroes; therefore, training would be costly and useless. This argument is invalid on its face. School systems have the moral and legal obligation to give all persons the best training and education possible. Moreover, changes in employment opportunity for Negroes in industry, commerce, and government further invalidate the position. President Kennedy's Executive Order 10925 forbidding racial discrimination in federal employment as well as in industries having government contracts has opened new areas of employment opportunity for Negroes. Negroes themselves are using economic and political pressures to achieve improvement in job opportunity. Rapid adjustments in the education of Negroes to meet the demands of new employment opportunity are both urgent and necessary.

Costs of Discrimination

The President's Council of Economic Advisers asserted in 1962 that losses to the economy through racial discrimination result from two factors: (1) inefficiencies in the use of the labor force resulting from failure to utilize fully the existing skills of our population; and (2) failure to develop potential skills fully. The Council estimated that the nation's economy is losing between $13 billion and $17 billion per year in national income and product as result of these two factors.

Fifty percent of the nation's Negroes are concentrated in the South, and the South receives approximately 20% of the nation's total income. A conservative estimate is that the South loses from $5 to $6 billion annually because of racial discrimination.

The South can no longer afford the luxury of wast-

*This school was desegregated on January 28, 1963, but only a token number of Negroes has been accepted for training.

ing a valuable human resource. It cannot continue to deny itself better markets for goods and services by failing to provide a climate of equal economic opportunity for all its citizens. It is equally clear that the nation can ill afford to lose $17 billion per year in income and product. To achieve full equality with other regions of the nation, the South must achieve full utilization of its manpower. For the nation as a whole, the continuing struggle of the cold war makes the full use of America's human resources imperative.

Race Relations and Economic Growth

Despite the relatively low income per person of Negroes, there are twice as many with income as there were a decade or so ago. Negroes have moved ahead educationally. More of them are concentrated in the cities. They are acquiring greater political strength in the urban areas, and they are more sensitive to their role in the politics and market place of the city and the state.

Political strength and purchasing power among urban Negroes can scarcely be ignored by government officials, city planners, business, and industry. With a new industrial-urban orientation, Negroes will increasingly apply political and economic pressures to bring about changes in southern race relations, to step up the momentum of school desegregation, to obtain better employment opportunity, and to obtain access to public facilities.

Rapid racial adjustments by the "new South" are vitally important to the economic health of the region. Tensions generated by poor race relations are not conducive to economic growth. *Chaos over school desegregation, boycotts to achieve employment opportunity, sit-in demonstrations, and picket lines, all are simply and tragically inimical to the economic life of the region.* Positive steps toward good race relations, the full absorption of Negroes into the mainstream of the region —these are imperative to leadership seeking a healthy South.

Public Policy

Clearly involved in the whole question of improving the economic position of Negroes is the influence of public policy on school desegregation, employment opportunity, and the elimination of segregation in housing and public places.

Low income Negroes and whites in large numbers are relocating themselves in the urban centers of the South just as they are in the North. Without extraordinary economic expansion and rapid improvement in the distribution of income, without swift changes in southern race relations, it is apparent that in the next decade the bulk of southern poverty will complete its shift from the country to the city.

Negro poverty will take its place in the urban slums of the South as a substitute for the traditional rural poverty—which, at least, was relatively self-sufficient. This concentration of low-income people in urban areas raises critical questions for southern city planners and officials.

The national expansion of the economy and technology, which began 20 years ago to alter the position of Negroes cannot be relied upon exclusively to bring about the level of improvement necessary in the future. Public policy will have to play an increased role. This means the expansion and strengthening of programs at local, state,* and federal levels to promote "fair employment practices"; the expansion of minimum wage coverage; more extensive area redevelopment programs; more extensive and inclusive programs of adult education and adult training and retraining programs. All these policies and programs must be advanced along with school desegregation. They will serve to reinforce change generated by normal economic forces.

That Negroes need improved economic opportunity is clear. That poverty among Negroes is being transferred from the rural South to the urban South is equally clear. Welfare dependency in urban areas will not solve the problem. Basically, the solution rests with full opportunity for the development of manpower potential and for employment and occupational mobility.

Employers, government officials, southern educators, southern school boards, and local communities must recognize what continued failure to meet the demands of Negro manpower development will mean. Not only will uneducated and inexperienced Negro manpower continue to contribute to labor surpluses, the very heart of the South's problem, but also the drain on urban economies in supporting undeveloped manpower will continue to impede the progress of both southern and national economic growth.

---

*On March 17, 1963 Kentucky Governor Bert Combs signed a code of fair practices, making Kentucky the first southern state to adopt such a measure. The code prohibits discrimination in employment and job opportunity, financial assistance, licensing, training programs, parks, and hospitals.

APPENDIX

TABLE 21. DISTRIBUTION OF INCOME OF FAMILIES, UNITED STATES AND SOUTH* BY COLOR, 1954-1961

	1961				1954			
	United States		South		United States		South	
Family Income Level	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite
Percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Under $4,000	37.7	60.2	38.7	80.0	44.1	78.2	53.9	87.0
$4,000-$5,999	22.4	19.7	23.3	13.0	28.7	14.5	24.8	8.7
$6,000 and Over	49.7	20.1	37.9	7.0	27.2	7.4	21.3	4.3
Percent of Change in Distribution Ratio 1954-1961								
Under $4,000	−37.1	−23.0	−28.2	− 8.0				
$4,000-$5,999	−18.4	+35.8	− 6.0	+51.1				
$6,000 and Over	+83.7	171.6	+21.8	+62.8				

SOURCE: U. S. Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Reports, Consumers Income* Series P-60, No. 20, December 1953 Table 2 and No. 37, January 17, 1962 Table 16 P-60, No. 39, February 28, 1963 Table 18.
*Includes Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Oklahoma, Texas, and West Virginia.

TABLE 22. DISTRIBUTION OF INCOME OF FAMILIES, UNITED STATES AND ELEVEN SOUTHERN STATES BY COLOR, 1960

	U.S.	Ala.	Ark.	Fla.	Ga.	Ky.	La.	Miss.	N.C.	S.C.	Tenn.	Va.
Under $2,000												
Nonwhite	32.4	49.9	61.1	32.1	45.9	39.8	45.1	66.2	50.2	57.7	44.3	35.5
White	11.0	18.9	26.4	13.6	15.3	25.1	14.6	22.0	17.3	14.0	22.4	7.8
$2,000-$2,999												
Nonwhite	15.5	17.9	18.4	22.3	21.8	17.9	20.7	16.7	19.9	19.2	19.5	18.6
White	7.6	10.7	14.6	10.5	10.4	11.6	9.6	12.4	11.5	10.5	11.8	8.9
$3,000-$3,999												
Nonwhite	13.5	12.4	9.5	18.7	13.0	15.1	13.3	8.0	12.8	10.4	14.3	15.6
White	9.1	11.4	13.4	12.0	11.8	11.1	10.8	13.0	13.6	13.7	12.0	8.1
$4,000-$4,999												
Nonwhite	11.4	8.4	4.8	11.6	7.7	11.6	8.5	4.2	7.3	5.5	9.3	11.5
White	10.9	11.7	11.5	12.1	12.2	11.3	11.6	12.2	13.0	13.2	11.4	10.2
$5,000 and Over												
Nonwhite	27.2	11.4	6.1	15.1	11.6	15.6	12.2	5.0	9.6	7.0	12.6	18.8
White	61.4	47.2	34.3	51.9	50.2	40.8	53.5	40.3	44.7	48.6	42.5	68.0

SOURCE: U. S. Department of Commerce, *U. S. Census of Population 1960*, U. S. Summary, General Social and Economic Characteristics, Table 65.

TABLE 23. DISTRIBUTION OF INCOME BY FAMILIES FOR FIFTEEN SELECTED CITIES BY COLOR, 1960

City	Under $3,000		$3,000-$3,999		$4,000-$4,999		$5,000 and Over	
	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite
Atlanta	8.8	33.3	14.4	40.8	10.0	11.5	64.8	33.1
Birmingham	8.0	35.6	14.0	34.1	11.7	13.4	64.3	30.9
Charleston, S. C.	11.1	43.9	20.3	33.2	11.3	10.3	56.9	13.7
Dallas	7.8	34.7	13.7	40.3	9.9	13.7	69.4	19.3
Durham	8.0	30.3	18.3	42.5	13.1	11.4	60.6	13.9
Houston	7.3	34.9	13.9	36.0	9.9	14.4	70.0	24.7
Jackson, Miss.	5.7	34.3	13.3	44.3	10.9	9.7	70.0	11.4
Little Rock	8.8	31.7	18.7	42.1	11.3	9.0	61.2	16.4
Louisville	9.9	29.3	17.0	31.1	13.3	16.3	59.6	23.3
Memphis	7.3	33.3	24.0	42.0	13.3	12.3	48.4	19.3
Nashville	15.6	33.8	27.0	39.2	13.8	10.9	43.6	17.1
New Orleans	8.8	33.0	18.0	37.0	12.0	13.3	61.1	20.6
Oklahoma City	9.4	28.0	14.7	30.4	11.9	14.7	63.0	26.9
Richmond	6.9	25.6	14.7	33.3	11.3	13.3	67.1	26.0
Norfolk	16.4	30.3	13.4	34.9	10.0	13.6	59.3	21.3

SOURCE: U. S. Department of Commerce, *U. S. Census of Population and Housing 1960.*

TABLE 24. DISTRIBUTION OF INCOME OF PERSONS 14 YEARS AND OVER WITH INCOME FOR UNITED STATES AND ELEVEN SOUTHERN STATES BY COLOR, 1950-1960

	Under $3,000				$3,000-$3,999			
	White		Nonwhite		White		Nonwhite	
	1960	1950	1960	1950	1960	1950	1960	1950
United States	38.0	48.8	58.2	77.4	11.7	21.2	14.8	12.8
Alabama	44.3	62.2	78.5	88.2	13.6	18.3	11.0	9.2
Arkansas	53.3	71.2	83.8	93.4	14.4	14.2	9.2	3.8
Florida	40.7	53.7	65.2	88.8	13.9	18.9	19.0	9.4
Georgia	42.1	62.0	76.0	92.2	13.1	18.9	13.6	5.2
Kentucky	48.7	64.1	69.2	84.2	12.9	18.2	13.2	12.4
Louisiana	40.2	54.8	73.8	89.2	13.0	18.2	12.8	8.2
Mississippi	49.6	69.2	86.5	96.1	14.7	14.4	8.2	2.1
North Carolina	44.1	61.9	74.8	90.1	17.2	21.2	12.9	7.9
South Carolina	41.9	59.0	80.7	94.8	17.3	22.9	11.8	4.2
Tennessee	48.8	65.0	72.2	87.7	14.5	16.8	12.7	9.9
Virginia	39.7	52.7	65.8	84.4	13.1	20.6	15.0	12.6

	$3,000-$3,999				$4,000-$4,999			
	White		Nonwhite		White		Nonwhite	
United States	11.4	15.5	10.9	8.1	10.6	6.6	7.9	0.9
Alabama	11.8	10.4	6.8	1.4	9.2	4.1	3.9	0.3
Arkansas	10.9	7.5	3.8	1.0	7.1	3.1	1.8	0.2
Florida	12.2	12.3	9.2	1.2	9.6	5.2	3.7	0.3
Georgia	13.2	9.8	5.8	0.8	9.5	3.8	2.7	0.2
Kentucky	11.0	9.6	8.4	2.6	8.8	3.8	5.3	0.4
Louisiana	11.4	12.6	6.6	1.9	9.8	6.4	3.7	0.3
Mississippi	11.5	8.3	3.0	0.3	7.8	3.5	1.4	0.1
North Carolina	14.8	8.9	4.0	1.3	9.1	3.4	2.8	0.3
South Carolina	15.7	10.2	4.5	0.7	9.2	3.5	1.7	0.1
Tennessee	11.5	9.6	7.5	1.7	8.1	3.8	4.0	0.4
Virginia	12.2	13.4	9.5	2.2	10.4	5.3	5.9	0.4

	$5,000 and Over			
	White		Nonwhite	
United States	29.2	8.0	8.1	0.7
Alabama	21.2	5.2	2.6	0.2
Arkansas	14.3	4.1	1.3	0.2
Florida	33.6	7.8	2.6	0.3
Georgia	20.0	5.4	2.0	0.2
Kentucky	18.3	4.4	2.8	0.4
Louisiana	26.8	8.0	3.0	0.5
Mississippi	16.3	4.6	0.9	0.0
North Carolina	14.7	4.6	1.5	0.3
South Carolina	8.1	3.8	4.0	0.4
Tennessee	17.8	4.9	2.6	0.3
Virginia	24.6	7.7	3.9	0.4

SOURCE: U. S. Department of Commerce, *1950 U. S. Census of Population*, Detailed Characteristics.
U. S. Census of Population, 1960, General Social and Economic Characteristics.